



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/516,480	10/05/2005	Steven P Buysse	2134CONCIPPCTUS	2853
50855	7590	10/29/2007	EXAMINER	
COVIDIEN			YABUT, DIANE D	
60 MIDDLETOWN AVENUE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NORTH HAVEN, CT 06473			3734	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/29/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/516,480	BUYSSE ET AL.
	Examiner Diane Yabut	Art Unit 3734

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 October 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to applicant's amendment received 12 October 2007.

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Stone** (U.S. Pat. No. 5,573,534) in view of **Francese** (U.S. Patent No. 5,722,421) and **Klieman** (U.S. Patent No. 5,827,323).

Claims 1-4 and 7-9: Stone discloses a handle having an elongated tube 18 affixed thereto, the tube including first and second jaw members 82, 84 attached to a distal end thereof, the jaw members being movable from a first position for approximating tissue to at least one subsequent position for grasping tissue therebetween, each of the jaw members including an electrically conductive sealing surface, the handle including a fixed handle 14 and a movable handle 16, the movable handle being movable relative to the fixed handle to effect movement of the jaw members from the first position to the at

least one subsequent position for grasping tissue (Figures 1-2), the opposable sealing surfaces including a non-stick material coating which is deposited on the opposable sealing surfaces for reducing tissue adhesion during sealing process (col. 7, lines 25-34), means for connecting the jaw members to a source of electrosurgical energy including a pushrod **22** for connecting a first jaw member to a source of electrosurgical energy (col. 3, lines 15-21, col. 5, lines 60-67 to col. 6, lines 1-4), such that the opposable seal surfaces are capable of conducting electrosurgical energy through tissue held therebetween.

Stone discloses the claimed device except for a stop, disposed on or disposed adjacent to at least one of the sealing surfaces, for maintaining a minimum separation distance of at least about 0.03 millimeters, or in the range of about 0.03 millimeters to about 0.16 millimeters, between opposable sealing surfaces, and a means for maintaining a closure force in the range of about 3 kg/cm^2 to about 16 kg/cm^2 between opposable sealing surfaces, the maintaining means including a ratchet disposed within the fixed handle and at least one complimentary interlocking mechanical interface disposed on the movable handle, the ratchet and the complimentary interlocking mechanical interface providing at least one interlocking position for maintaining a closure force within the range of about 7 kg/cm^2 to about 13 kg/cm^2 or about 4 kg/cm^2 to 6.5 kg/cm^2 between opposable sealing surfaces.

Francesce teaches a stop **110** or **112**, disposed on or disposed adjacent to at least one of the sealing surfaces **36**, **38** for maintaining a minimum separation distance (Figure 8; col. 4, lines 46-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of invention to provide a stop to maintain a minimum separation device, as taught by Francese, to Stone in order to prevent excessive deflection of the jaws when closed (col. 2, lines 56-59), which may injure tissue. Although Francese does not expressly close the minimum separation distance being at least about 0.03 millimeters, or in the range of about 0.03 millimeters to about 0.16 millimeters, between opposable sealing surfaces, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide this range of values, since it has been held that discovering optimum or workable ranges involve only routine skill in the art.

Klieman discloses a means for maintaining a closure force between opposable sealing surfaces **40** and **44**, the maintaining means including a ratchet **16** disposed within the fixed handle and at least one complimentary interlocking mechanical interface **57** disposed on the movable handle **4**, the ratchet and the complimentary interlocking mechanical interface providing at least one interlocking position for maintaining a closure force (Figures 5A-5B). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide a means for maintaining a closure force between opposable sealing surfaces, as taught by Klieman, to Stone in order for the surgeon to operably control and maintain the force applied by the jaws to effectively grasp tissue while avoiding injury. Although Klieman does not expressly disclose the closure force being within the range of about maintaining a closure force in the range of about 3 kg/cm² to about 16 kg/cm² 7 kg/cm² to about 13 kg/cm² or about 4 kg/cm² to 6.5 kg/cm² between opposable sealing surfaces, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art to provide this range of values, since it has been held that discovering optimum or workable ranges involve only routine skill in the art.

Claims 10-14: Stone discloses the opposable sealing surfaces being manufactured from a non-stick material or a non-stick coating being selected from a group of materials consisting of nitrides and nickel/chrome alloys, including at least one of: TiN; ZrN; TiAIN; CrN; nickel/chrome alloys with a Ni/Cr ratio of approximately 5:1; Inconel 600; Ni200; and Ni201 (col. 9, lines 7-44).

Claims 15-17: Stone discloses at least one of the jaw members, handles and elongated tube including an insulative material **30** serving as a coating or sheath disposed thereon (Figure 1, col. 6, lines 5-14).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Diane Yabut whose telephone number is (571) 272-6831. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 9AM-4PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Hayes can be reached on (571) 272-4959. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3734

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DY



MICHAEL J. HAYES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER